

Penrose Limits, the Colliding Plane Wave Problem and the Classical String Backgrounds.

Alexander Feinstein

*Dpto. de Física Teórica, Universidad del País Vasco,
Apdo. 644, E-48080, Bilbao, Spain*

Abstract

We show how the Szekeres form of the line element is naturally adapted to study Penrose limits in classical string backgrounds. Relating the “old” colliding wave problem to the Penrose limiting procedure as employed in string theory we discuss how two orthogonal Penrose limits uniquely determine the underlying target space when certain symmetry is imposed. We construct a conformally deformed background with two distinct, yet exactly solvable in terms of the string theory on R-R backgrounds, Penrose limits. Exploiting further the similarities between the two problems we find that the Penrose limit of the gauged WZW Nappi-Witten universe is itself a gauged WZW plane wave solution of Sfetsos and Tseytlin. Finally, we discuss some issues related to singularity, show the existence of a large class of non-Hausdorff solutions with Killing Cauchy Horizons and indicate a possible resolution of the problem of the definition of quantum vacuum in string theory on these time-dependent backgrounds.

Penrose limit [1], [2], a limiting procedure applied to a null geodesic in a generic spacetime and resulting in a p-p wave, has attracted considerable attention recently [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. The main interest stems from the fact that string theory is exactly solvable for certain plane waves both in NS-NS and R-R backgrounds [8], [9]. Another point of interest is the relation, via the Penrose limit, of the maximally supersymmetric backgrounds of the M-theory, the so-called $AdS \times S$ solutions with those of the *IIB* superstring theory [4]. These relations have inspired an interesting derivation of the spectrum of *IIB* theory on Minkowski and maximally supersymmetric Hpp-wave spacetimes using the AdS/CFT correspondence [10] for the holographic dual of $d = 4$, $N = 4$ Super-Yang-Mills theory.

The main purpose of this Letter is to establish and exploit the relation between the well-studied problem of the collision of plane waves in General Relativity and the Penrose limiting procedure, as presented in the context of the string theory.

To keep the discussion in a way familiar to relativists we will stick to 4-dimensional space times. The generalisation to higher dimensions is quite straight forward and will not add qualitatively to the issues discussed in this paper. Our starting point will be the so-called $AdS_2 \times S^2$ spacetime, called otherwise the Bertotti-Robinson solution [11], [12]:

$$ds^2 = \frac{q^2}{r^2}(-dt^2 + dr^2 + r^2 d\theta^2 + r^2 \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) \quad (1)$$

The line element (1) is a non-singular solution of Einstein-Maxwell equations with a uniform electromagnetic field such that $F_{ab}F^{ab} = q^2 = \text{constant}$. In higher dimensions the electromagnetic field is generalised to p-form potentials. In the context of supergravity theory, this solution was discussed in [13].

The Bertotti-Robinson universe has been also a subject of an extensive study in the context of the so-called colliding plane wave problem in General Relativity [14] (and the references therein). The idea is that the line element (1) can be seen as produced in a non-linear interaction (collision) of two plane electromagnetic waves with constant, not necessarily equal, profiles.

To put the metric into the form convenient from the point of view of the colliding wave problem one performs the following co-ordinate transformation (see for example [14])

$$\begin{aligned} t + r &= \coth[\tfrac{1}{2} \operatorname{sech}^{-1}(\cos(au + bv)) - \tfrac{y}{2q}] \\ t - r &= -\tanh[\tfrac{1}{2} \operatorname{sech}^{-1}(\cos(au + bv)) + \tfrac{y}{2q}] \\ \theta &= \pi/2 - (bv - au) \\ \phi &= x/q, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2ab}}$. With this we obtain:

$$ds^2 = -2dudv + \cos^2[au - bv]dx^2 + \cos^2[au + bv]dy^2 \quad (3)$$

The positive constants a and b are related to the strengths of the incoming electromagnetic plane waves. In these co-ordinates, and extended into the plane wave regions by introducing $u \rightarrow u\Theta(u)$ and $v \rightarrow v\Theta(v)$, where $\Theta(u)$ and $\Theta(v)$ are the usual Heaviside functions, the line element is called the Bell-Szekeres solution [15]. For more details on this solution in the context of the classical colliding wave problem the reader is addressed to [15, 16, 17] and the monograph [14]. The quantum field theory on the Bell-Szekeres background was discussed in [18].

Now, to obtain the Penrose limit for the Bell-Szekeres (Bertotti-Robinson- $AdS_2 \times S^2$) spacetime, in the sense used in string theory, becomes quite simple. Put the parameters $a = 0$, or $b = 0$ and we get plane wave limiting behaviour, both in the metric and the electromagnetic field. Note, that these Penrose limits formally coincide with the incoming plane waves producing the interaction region (3). In the colliding wave problem, the parameters a and b are related to the focal lengths of the plane waves $L_1 \sim a^{-1}$ and $L_2 \sim b^{-1}$, which in turn measure the strength of the incoming waves. Long focal length corresponds to a weak wave and vice versa. It is easy to show that the procedure to obtain the limit is equivalent to the scaling introduced in the string theory context [2, 3, 4]. We will not expand on this issue here, but will just mention that in practice, to obtain the limiting behaviour of the metric one may also consider dropping the dependence of the metric on u or on v [4], or, which is equivalent, substituting $u = 0$ or $v = 0$, or in turn equivalent to introducing the Heaviside functions as in colliding wave approach. We will therefore refer to these limits the v -limit ($u = 0$) and the u -limit ($v = 0$) respectively. It is this observation which takes us to explore the relation between the colliding wave problem and the notion of the Penrose limit further.

In general, the Penrose limit may be evaluated for an arbitrary spacetime. In practice, however, it is sufficient, especially with the string theory in the back of our mind, to concentrate on spacetimes with at least two commuting spacelike Killing vectors ($N - 2$ Killing vectors in a general higher dimensional case). To simplify our discussion further we will be concentrating on those spacetimes for which the Killing vectors are mutually orthogonal. This will keep the 4-dimensional line element diagonal, and will allow us to cast the metric into the following so-called Szekeres form [19]:

$$ds^2 = -f(u, v) du dv + G(u, v) (e^{p(u, v)} dx^2 + e^{-p(u, v)} dy^2). \quad (4)$$

Any 4-dimensional spacetime with two orthogonal Killing directions can be put into the above form, spacetime (3) being a special case. For pure gravitational fields, or in the case of massless fields such as dilaton, electromagnetic waves etc., the function $G(u, v)$ satisfies the wave equation $G(u, v)_{uv} = 0$, when working in the Einstein frame. For general matter fields, however, this isn't necessary the case. The v and the u Penrose limits of the above spacetime are easily found by taking $u = 0$ and

$v = 0$, or, again, by dropping the dependence of the metric on u or on v .¹ To write the plane wave in Rosen [22] co-ordinates, after the limit is taken, one must rescale the u or v co-ordinate with $f(u)du \rightarrow du$ or $f(v)dv \rightarrow dv$. The metric then becomes, say in u -limit:

$$ds^2 = -dudv + G(u) e^{p(u)} dx^2 + G(u) e^{-p(u)} dy^2 \quad (5)$$

The matter fields are treated by the same token. A similar scheme one follows extending the Szekeres line-element into the plane wave regions. However, the evaluation of the Penrose limit is much simpler procedure. In the case of the collision of plane waves, one must extend smoothly the interaction region into the plane wave regions imposing boundary conditions on the null hypersurfaces, both for the gravitational and the matter waves. In the case of the Penrose limit, one does not extend the spacetime across the null hypersurfaces staying “inside” the background spacetime, therefore there are no smoothness restrictions.

A different observation, because of the similarity of the two problems, may be made about the uniqueness relation between the interaction region, and the two u and v null limits. Given both u and v -limits, and the first two derivatives of the metric in these limits, and the field equations, they *uniquely* determine the whole spacetime, this is because the initial value problem in the context of the colliding wave problem is well posed and defined: given the data on the null boundaries (Penrose limits, and the derivatives), the solution in the “inside” region is unique. The above statement is of course true as long as the governing field equations are the low energy equations of the string theory, i.e. the Einstein Equations. In general, it is possible that one would have to rely on higher derivatives when imposing the vanishing of the β functions.

Moreover, since Penrose limit is taken both in the metric and matter field components, and not on the level of phenomenological stress-energy tensors as sometimes done in the colliding wave problem, the *ambiguity problem* [20] of possible non-unique evolution when the matter fields are not specified, but rather represented by the algebraic form of the stress-tensor, does not apply. The uniqueness of the Szekeres background, given the two Penrose limits, in the sense that the spacetime is completely determined by the two limiting metrics and the associated matter fields, may have important consequences for the string theory. Till now, we have had a rough relation between the whole space and a single plane-wave limit. Now, we have a one-to-one correspondence. Thus $AdS \times S$ background is completely determined by the two “orthogonal” Penrose limits. Having only one limit does not determine the whole spacetime. Thus, the two orthogonal Penrose limits form a sort of classical *holographic boundary* for the background with $N - 2$ commuting Killing directions. To push this idea somewhat further we will give below an explicit example of a deformed spacetime with one plane wave limit exactly as in $AdS \times S$, but the other

¹To be more formal, one can always introduce scaling parameters a and b into the co-ordinates u and v and then consider the limit as $a \rightarrow 0$. I am grateful to Jerry Griffiths for prodding me to clarify this point.

quite different.

Exploiting the analogy between the problems, we can also comment about the hereditary properties in the sense of isometries. The situation is that generically plane waves have at least a five-dimensional group of isometries in four dimensions. Upon collision this symmetry is broken and reduced to at least two Killing fields, in x and y directions in our notation. Vice versa, the two Killing directions are always trivially conserved in the null limit. Other commuting Killing directions are also conserved. Moreover, generically to the two Killing directions one must add another three in the plane wave limit. For more elaborated discussion on this issue see ref. [3].

As far as curvature singularity is concerned, generically the Szekeres geometries have curvature singularity at $G = 0$, yet there is a class of solutions which instead of the singularity at $G = 0$ present a Cauchy Horizon with possible non-Hausdorff extensions. We will comment about these solutions towards the end of the paper.

With all this in mind let us consider several examples which may be of interest in the string theory setting. Our first example will be the spacetime which has Penrose v-limit exactly as the $AdS_2 \times S^2$, but its u-limit is Minkowski. This background, or target space, in the language of string theory, may be thought of as a non-conformal deformation of $AdS_2 \times S^2$, or more precisely, of its Penrose limit. Surprisingly, however, the two different Penrose limits are exactly solvable string backgrounds, one the Minkowski spacetime and the other the electromagnetic plane wave with the constant profile, the one, one obtains in the $AdS \times S$ case.

We will write the spacetime directly in Szekeres co-ordinates:

$$f = \frac{\cos bv \sqrt{1 - a^2 u^2}}{\sqrt{\cos^2 bv - a^2 u^2}}, \quad G = \cos^2 bv - a^2 u^2, \quad p = \log \frac{(1 - au)}{(1 + au)} \quad (6)$$

with the electromagnetic field given (in the notation of [14]):

$$\Phi_0 = B \frac{b \cos bv}{\sqrt{\cos^2 bv - a^2 u^2}}, \quad \Phi_2 = A \frac{a \sin bv}{(1 - a^2 u^2) \sqrt{\cos^2 bv - a^2 u^2}} \quad (7)$$

Here a and b are constants and the functions A and B are defined via $l_\mu = A^{-1} \delta_\mu^0$, $n_\mu = B^{-1} \delta_\mu^1$ and the vectors l_μ and n_μ are null vectors orthogonal to the planes spanned by the Killing vectors.

This solution was first integrated in [21] and represents in the context of the colliding wave problem a region due to the interaction of a plane gravitational and plane electromagnetic wave. The parameter a may be considered conformality parameter, as $a \rightarrow 0$ we recover the conformal background. We now take the Penrose limits. The u-limit ($B_{v=0} \rightarrow 0$) is:

$$ds^2 = -2dudv + (1 - au)^2 dx^2 + (1 + au)^2 dy^2, \quad (8)$$

with no electromagnetic field present, while the v-limit ($A_{u=0} \rightarrow 0$) becomes:

$$ds^2 = -2dudv + \cos^2(bv) (dx^2 + dy^2), \quad \Phi_0 = b \quad (9)$$

Both line elements are written in the so-called Rosen [22] co-ordinates, where the metric is cast in the following form:

$$ds^2 = -2dudv + d^2 dx^2 + c^2 dy^2, \quad (10)$$

here d and c are functions of u or v alone. To put the metric into the so-called Brinkmann-Peres form [23], [24]:

$$ds^2 = -2dudr - (h_{11}X^2 + h_{22}Y^2) du^2 + dX^2 + dY^2, \quad (11)$$

one must perform the following co-ordinate transformation

$$X = dx, \quad Y = dy, \quad r = v + \frac{1}{2}dd'x^2 + \frac{1}{2}cc'y^2, \quad (12)$$

here $'$ denotes derivative with respect to the argument, and d , c , h_{11} and h_{22} are related by:

$$d'' = -h_{11}d, \quad c'' = -h_{22}c. \quad (13)$$

We note therefore, that the Brinkmann-Peres wave amplitudes h_{11} and h_{22} can be directly read off from the Rosen form. Incidentally, the Weyl and the energy momentum tensor components can be expressed directly via the Rosen functions d and c as [14]

$$\Psi_4 = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{cd'' - dc''}{dc}, \quad \Phi_{22} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{cd'' + dc''}{dc}. \quad (14)$$

Consequently, returning to our solution, the limit (8) is just Minkowski spacetime, while the limit (9) gives:

$$ds^2 = -2dudr - b^2(X^2 + Y^2)du^2 + dX^2 + dY^2 \quad (15)$$

Both limiting spacetimes play central role in recent investigations of the string theory. The Minkowski background for obvious reasons, but the line element (15) has a very special relation to string theory. It belongs to a class of the so-called Cahen-Wallach spacetimes [25] with constant negative eigenvalues $-b^2$. The higher dimensional analogs of these spacetimes were studied as exactly solvable string theories in Ramond-Ramond background. We therefore conclude here, that if there is any deep relation between the plane-wave limits and the underlying target space geometry, this must be inferred from the two orthogonal Penrose limits, rather than from a single one. The existence of curvature singularity in a deformed target space signals yet another problem. We will comment about this below.

Let us consider now the Penrose limits of the so-called Nappi-Witten cosmological solution. The four-dimensional cosmology studied by Nappi and Witten [26] results

as the target space theory of a $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times SU(2)/\mathbb{R} \times U(1)$ gauged Wess-Zumino-Witten model. The solution contains, besides the metric, non-trivial values for the dilaton and antisymmetric tensor field. The solution containing the non-vanishing B-field can be obtained by an $O(2, 2; \mathbb{R})$ rotation of the metric given below [27, 28] (for a review see [29]).

The typical Nappi-Witten line element belongs to the general class of closed inhomogeneous dilaton cosmologies [31] and is given by:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + dw^2 + \tan^2 w dx^2 + \cot^2 t dy^2, \quad (16)$$

together with the dilaton field

$$\phi = \phi_0 - \log(\sin^2 t \cos^2 w) \quad (17)$$

The above line element is written in string frame and may be thought of as a product of two two-dimensional black holes with Euclidean and Lorentzian signatures, both being exact string backgrounds [30], corresponding to a $SL(2, \mathbb{R})/SO(1, 1) \times SU(2)/U(1)$ coset model. Due to the presence of the non-trivial dilaton field the Einstein and the string frames are not exactly equivalent and to study the Penrose limit it is convenient here to stick to the string frame. The line element is already written in Szekeres co-ordinates (just take $t + w = u$ and $t - w = v$) and it is easy to see that both u and v limits are equivalent. Taking say the u - limit $v \rightarrow 0$, we obtain:

$$ds^2 = -2dudv + \tan^2 \frac{u}{2} dx^2 + \cot^2 \frac{u}{2} dy^2, \quad \phi = \phi'_0 - 2 \log(\sin u) \quad (18)$$

It is easy to see that the Penrose limit of the Nappi-Witten universe is the plane wave solution that may be obtained also from the gauged $[SU(2) \times SL(2, \mathbb{R})] / [U(1) \times \mathbb{R}]$ WZW model as given in [32].

The harmonic forms of the wave amplitudes h_{11} and h_{22} are given by:

$$h_{11} = -2/\cos^2 \frac{u}{2}, \quad h_{22} = -2/\sin^2 \frac{u}{2} \quad (19)$$

It is interesting to see how the Penrose limits of this model differ from the one evaluated for the FRW cosmology. Let us consider the spatially flat model for simplicity. The models with non-zero spatial curvature may be written in Szekeres-like co-ordinates along the lines of the work [33], where one may also find the higher dimensional non-singular generalisations of these models. The line element for the spatially flat isotropic dilaton solution of Einstein field equations is given by:

$$ds^2 = t(-dt^2 + dx^2 + dy^2 + dz^2) \quad \phi = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \log t \quad (20)$$

The string frame metric is obtained by globally multiplying the line element by $e^{2\phi}$. Introducing a pair of null co-ordinates as before, taking the $v = 0$ -Penrose limit and rescaling the co-ordinate u , we get:

$$ds^2 = -2dudv + u^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}+2}} (dx^2 + dy^2) \quad (21)$$

The harmonic functions h_{11} and h_{22} are then given by:

$$h_{11} = h_{22} = \frac{3 + 2\sqrt{3}}{4(2 + \sqrt{3})^2} u^{-2}, \quad (22)$$

in agreement with [3]. It is not clear as to whether this limiting behaviour is of some interest in the stringy context.

As mentioned above, the Szekeres geometry is singular at $G = 0$. However, there exist a class of solutions [34] where instead of curvature singularity at $G = 0$ there appears the so-called Cauchy Horizon. The manifold is therefore non-Hausdorff, in the sense that there exist different non-equivalent analytic extensions across the Horizon. Near the curvature singularity the geometry behaves as a Kasner model (see for example [35] and [36] where these models were studied in the context of the pre big bang cosmology). Near the Cauchy Horizon, on the other hand, the line element has degenerate Kasner exponents $(0, 1, 0)$:

$$ds^2 \sim -2dudv + (a - u - v)^2 dx^2 + dy^2, \quad (23)$$

which we recognize as Milne universe ($t = a - u - v$ and $z = u - v$ etc.) The models with Cauchy Horizon were not considered of interest in the context of the pre big bang cosmology [37] due to the belief that one must have strong coupling regime near the singularity. Another crucial point was that the singular models were related to the pbb inflation to resolve the usual cosmological problems. In the renewed attempt to have a “go” at the pbb idea [38], it is exactly the weak coupling behaviour near the $t \rightarrow 0$, corresponding to regular dilaton leading to the Killing Cauchy Horizon, that is preferred. It remains to be seen how these models may tackle the real cosmological problems (see though [39]), yet the singularity problem in these models is of a different kind and there are some new ideas as to how to approach the resolution of this problem [40] in string theory.

To construct backgrounds with such properties (Cauchy Horizons), consider the following dilaton solution of Einstein equations:

$$ds^2 = -f(t, \theta) (dt^2 - d\theta^2) + G(t, \theta) (e^{p(t, \theta)} d\varphi^2 + e^{-p(t, \theta)} d\psi^2), \quad (24)$$

with

$$f = (\cos^2 t - \cos^2 \theta) e^{b^2 G^2}, \quad G = \sin \theta \sin t, \quad p = \log G, \quad (25)$$

along with

$$\phi = b \cos(\theta) \cos(t), \quad (26)$$

and the co-ordinates are taken to be Euler angles. An infinite dimensional families of such “non-singular” solutions may be constructed by for example choosing the scalar field in terms of regular Legendre functions $P_l(\cos t) P_l(\cos \theta)$, or their linear combinations, and then integrating the function f , keeping p and G unchanged along the lines of [31] (see as well [33] in M-theory context). Note that without the dilaton ($b \rightarrow 0$), the solution is flat. The dilaton is regular at $G = 0$. The regularity of the dilaton introduces an essentially different behaviour as compared to the Nappi-Witten background. The near Horizon geometry ($\phi \rightarrow b$, $f \rightarrow \cos^2 t - \cos^2 \theta$) is given by (23) and is Milne, and both orthogonal Penrose limits near the Horizon are of course flat.

The telling point, apart from being useful for modeling different approaches to resolution of the singularity problem, is that these non-Hausdorff time dependent backgrounds could be used to understand the definition of quantum vacuum states, one of the central problems of the string theory on non-trivial time dependent backgrounds. The situation resembles that of quantizing matter fields on the spacetimes with Killing-Cauchy Horizons [41], [18]. What one does in these situations, is to define the “in” vacuum on the Penrose boundaries. The “out” vacuum can be defined with the help of the null Killing fields of the Killing Cauchy Horizon. Note, that the existence of the preferred vacuum state, invariant under the symmetries associated with the Killing-Cauchy Horizon, follows from the Kay and Wald theorem [42], who also have shown that this preferred state is *unique*. We believe that this is a path worth being explored in details in the future.

To conclude, we have shown that there is an intimate relation between the concept of Penrose limit and the problem of classical relativity which studies the outcome of the collision between the plane waves. This relation was exploited to shed some light on several issues of the string theory. We have argued that with certain symmetries given, the spacetime, the arena for string propagation, is uniquely determined by the two orthogonal Penrose limits along with a couple of derivatives of the metric in these limits. This of course is true as long as the pertinent equations of the theory are the Einstein equations, i.e. the low energy equations of the string theory. In the full fledged string theory, one would probably need to rely on higher derivatives as well. It would be interesting to consider this question with more rigor in future. We have shown the existence of non-Hausdorff backgrounds with Killing Cauchy Horizons instead of curvature singularities, symmetries of which can be used to determine the vacuum state of the string theory. We have given a simple way to evaluate Penrose limits, and have done so for several examples relevant to string theory.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to J.B. Griffiths and J.L. Mañes for valuable comments and suggestions. This work was supported by the University of the Basque Country Grants UPV 172. 310-GO 2/99 and The Spanish Science Ministry Grant 1/CI-CYT 00172. 310-0018-12205/2000.

References

1. R. Penrose, “Any spacetime has a plane wave as a limit”, in *Differential Geometry*, pp 271. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1976
2. R. Güeven, Phys. Lett. **B482**, 255 (2000)
3. M. Blau, J. M. Figueroa-O’Farrill and G. Papadopoulos, “Penrose limits, supergravity and brane dynamics”, arXiv: hep-th/0202111
4. M. Blau, J.M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, C. Hull and G. Papadopoulos, “Penrose limits and maximal supersymmetry”, arXiv: hep-th/0201081
M. Blau, J.M. Figueroa-O’Farrill, C. Hull and G. Papadopoulos, JHEP **0201**, 047 (0202)
5. U. Gursoy, C. Nuñez and M. Schvellinger, “RG flows from Spin(7). CY 4-fold and HK manifolds to AdS, Penrose limits and pp waves”, arXiv: hep-th/0203124
6. L. Pando Zayas and J. Sonnenschein, “ On Penrose limits and Gauge Theories”, arXiv: hep-th/0202186
7. V. Hubney, M. Rangamani and E. Verlinde “Penrose limits and non-local theories”, arXiv: hep-th/0205258
8. D. Amati and C. Klimcik, Phys. Lett. **B210**, 92
G.T. Horowitz and A.R. Stief, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 260 (1990)
H. J. de Vega and N. Sanchez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1517 (1990)
O. Jofre and C. Nunez, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 5232 (1994).
9. R. R. Metsaev, “Type II Green-Schwartz superstring in plane wave Ramon-Ramon background”, arXiv: hep-th/0112044
R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, “Exactly solvable model of superstring in plane wave Ramon-Ramon background”, arXiv: hep-th/0202102.
10. D. Berenstein, J. Maldacena and H. Nastase “Strings in flat space and pp waves from $N = 4$ super Yang Mills”, arXiv: hep-th/0202021
11. B. Bertotti, Phys. Rev. **116**, 1331 (1959)
12. I. Robinson, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. **7**, 531 (1954)
13. J. Kowalski-Glikman, Phys. Lett. **150B**, 194 (1985)
14. J. B. Griffiths, *Colliding Plane Waves in General Relativity* (Claredon Press, Oxford 1991).

15. P. Bell and P. Szekeres, Gen. Rel. Grav. **5**, 275 (1974).
16. R. A. Matzner and F. J. Tipler, Phys. Rev. **D29**, 1575 (1984).
17. C. J. S. Clarke and S. A. Hayward, Class. Quantum Grav. **6**, 615 (1989).
18. A. Feinstein and M.A. Perez-Sebastian, Class. Quantum Grav. **12**, 2723 (1995)
19. P. Szekeres, Jour. Math. Phys. **13**, 286 (1972)
20. A. Feinstein, M.A.H. MacCallum and J.M.M. Senovilla, Class. Quantum Grav. **6**, L-217 (1989)
21. J. B. Griffiths, Phys. Lett. **A54**, 269 (1975)
22. N. Rosen, Phys. Z. Sovjet, **12**, 366 (1937)
23. M. W. Brinkmann, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, **9**, 3 (1923)
24. A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett., **3**, 571 (1959)
25. M. Cahen and N. Wallach, Bull. Am. Math. Soc. **76**, 585 (1970)
26. C. Nappi and E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **B293**, 309 (1992)
27. A. Giveon and A. Pasquinucci, Phys. Lett. **B294**, 162 (1992)
28. M. Gasperini, J. Maharana and G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. **B296**, 51 (1992)
29. A. Giveon, M. Porrati and E. Rabinovici, Phys. Rep. **244**, 77 (1994)
30. E. Witten, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 314 (1991)
31. M. Carmeli, Ch. Charach and A. Feinstein, Ann. Phys. **150**, 392 (1983)
32. K. Sfetsos and A. Tseytlin, Nuclear Phys. **B427**, 245 (1994)
33. A. Feinstein and M.A. Vázquez-Mozo, Nuclear Phys. **B568**, 405 (2000)
34. A. Feinstein and J. Ibáñez, Phys. Rev. **D39**, 470 (1989).
35. A. Feinstein, K. Kunze and M. A. Vázquez-Mozo, Class. Quant.Grav. **17**, 3599 (2000)
36. V. Bozza and G. Veneziano, JHEP **0010**, 035 (2000)
37. G. Veneziano, *String cosmology: The pre-big bang scenario*, in: “The Primordial Universe”, proceedings to the 1999 Les Houches Summer School, eds. P. Binetruy, R. Schaeffer, J. Silk and F. David. Springer-Verlag 2001, arXiv: hep-th/0002094;

- 38. J. Khoury, B. Ovrut, N. Seiberg, P. Steinhardt and N. Turok, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 086007 (2002)
- 39. A. Linde, “Inflationary Theory versus Ekpyrotic/Cyclic Scenario”, arXiv: hep-th/0205259
- 40. N. Seiberg, “From Big Crunch To Big Bang-Is it Possible?”, arXiv: hep-th/0201039
- 41. M. Dorca and E. Verdaguer, Nuclear Phys **B403**, 770 (1993)
- 42. B. Kay and R. M. Wald, Phys. Rep. **207**, 49 (1991)